

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

CORDIS CORPORATION,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 97-550-SLR
v.)	(Consolidated)
)	
MEDTRONIC AVE, INC.; BOSTON)	
SCIENTIFIC CORPORATION; and)	
SCIMED LIFE SYSTEMS, INC.,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
)	
<hr/>)	
MEDTRONIC AVE, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 97-700-SLR
v.)	
)	
CORDIS CORPORATION; JOHNSON &)	
JOHNSON; and EXPANDABLE GRAFTS)	
PARTNERSHIP,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

**CORDIS' REVISED PROPOSED FORM OF SPECIAL VERDICT
AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY (CORDIS v. MEDTRONIC AVE)**

Pursuant to Local Rule 51.1, Cordis Corporation hereby submits its revised proposed form of special verdict and interrogatories to the jury.

ASHBY & GEDDES

/s/ John G. Day

Steven J. Balick (I.D. #2114)

John G. Day (I.D. #2403)

222 Delaware Avenue, 17th Floor

P.O. Box 1150

Wilmington, DE 19801

(302) 654-1888

*Attorneys for Cordis Corporation and
related Johnson & Johnson parties*

Of Counsel:

Gregory L. Diskant
William F. Cavanaugh, Jr.
Kim J. Landsman
Eugene M. Gelernter
Michael J. Timmons
PATTERSON, BELKNAP, WEBB, & TYLER LLP
1133 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036
212-336-2000

Theodore B. Van Itallie, Jr.
Eric I. Harris
JOHNSON & JOHNSON
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933
732-524-0400

Dated: March 8, 2005
154366.1

CORDIS' PROPOSED SPECIAL VERDICT FORM

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

Infringement

All Claims

1. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the walls of the tubular members in the Microstent II are of substantially uniform thickness?

YES _____ NO _____

2. Has Cordis shown by a preponderance of the evidence that the walls of the tubular members in the GFX and GFXII stents are of substantially uniform thickness?

YES _____ NO _____

Validity

1. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 23 of the '762 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '762 patent?

YES _____ NO _____

2. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 51 of the '762 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '762 patent?

YES _____ NO _____

3. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 54 of the '762 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '762 patent?

YES _____ NO _____

4. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '984 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '984 patent?

YES _____ NO _____

5. Has Medtronic AVE shown by clear and convincing evidence that claim 3 of the '984 patent would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art as of the invention date of the '984 patent?

YES _____ NO _____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 8th day of March, 2005, the attached **CORDIS'** **REVISED PROPOSED FORM OF SPECIAL VERDICT AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY (CORDIS v. MEDTRONIC AVE)** was served upon the following counsel of record in the manner indicated:

Karen Jacobs Louden, Esquire
Morris Nichols Arsh & Tunnell
1201 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA ECF FILE AND SERVE

Raphael V. Lupo, Esquire
McDermott, Will & Emery
c/o Karen Jacobs Louden, Esquire
Morris Nichols Arsh & Tunnell
1201 N. Market Street
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA FACSIMILE

Josy W. Ingersoll, Esquire
Young Conaway Stargatt & Taylor
Rodney Square North
Wilmington, DE 19801

VIA ECF FILE AND SERVE

George E. Badenoch, Esquire
Kenyon & Kenyon
One Broadway
New York, NY 10004

VIA FACSIMILE

/s/ John G. Day
John G. Day